



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,047	10/26/2001	Hawkins Yao	069099.0102	7049

7590 08/09/2005

Paul N. Katz
Baker Botts L.L.P.
One Shell Plaza
910 Louisiana Street
Houston, TX 77002-4995

EXAMINER

PHILLIPS, HASSAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2151

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,047

Applicant(s)

YAO ET AL.

Examiner

Hassan Phillips

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of claims 1-8 in the reply filed on May 23, 2005 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Latif et al. (hereinafter Latif), U.S. Patent 6,400,730 in view of Nakamura, U.S. Patent 6,721,818.

4. In considering claim 1, Latif teaches a method for assigning an internal port address to uniquely identify a port associated with a routing processor of a network device associated with, and having a location within, a system, comprising: allocating a location section of the internal port address corresponding to the location of the network device, (col. 11, line 64-col. 12, line 67).

Although the teachings of Latif disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to disclose: allocating a routing processor section of the internal port address corresponding to a routing processor associated with the routing processor; and allocating a port section of the internal port address corresponding to the port.

Nevertheless retaining such information was well known in the art at the time of the present invention. This is exemplified by the teachings of Nakamura. More specifically, Nakamura teaches storing detailed information associated with a network device including: a processor section, and a port section, (col. 19, line 66-col. 20, line 18, also see Fig. 31).

Thus given the teachings of Nakamura it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Latif to further show allocating a routing processor section of the internal port address corresponding to a routing processor associated with the routing processor, and allocating a port section of the internal port address corresponding to the port. This would have further facilitated internal routing, (Latif, col. 2, lines 34-54), (Nakamura, col. 1, lines 58-63).

5. In considering claim 2, the combined teachings, as discussed in consideration of claim 1, provide a means for allocating a shelf section of the internal port address corresponding to the location of the network device within a shelf, (Latif, col. 11, line 64-col. 12, line 67), (Nakamura, (col. 19, line 66-col. 20, line 18, also see Fig. 31).

6. In considering claim 3, the combined teachings, as discussed in consideration of claim 1, provide a means for the network device to be associated with at least one geographical locator indicator, and the shelf section being derived from the geographical locator indicator, (Latif, col. 11, line 64-col. 12, line 67), (Nakamura, (col. 19, line 66-col. 20, line 18, also see Fig. 31).

7. In considering claim 4, the combined teachings, as discussed in consideration of claim 1, provide a means for allocating a slot section of the internal port address corresponding to the location of the network device within a slot, (Latif, col. 11, line 64-col. 12, line 67), (Nakamura, (col. 19, line 66-col. 20, line 18, also see Fig. 31).

8. In considering claim 5, the combined teachings, as discussed in consideration of claim 1, provide a means for the slot to be located within a shelf, (Latif, col. 11, line 64-col. 12, line 67), (Nakamura, (col. 19, line 66-col. 20, line 18, also see Fig. 31).

9. In considering claim 6, the combined teachings, as discussed in consideration of claim 1, provide a means for the network device to be associated with at least one geographical locator indicator, and the shelf section to be derived from the geographical locator indicator, (Latif, col. 11, line 64-col. 12, line 67), (Nakamura, (col. 19, line 66-col. 20, line 18, also see Fig. 31).

10. In considering claim 7, the combined teachings, as discussed in consideration of claim 1, provide a means for the routing processor to be associated with a PCI slot ID, and the routing processor section to be derived from the PCI slot ID, (Latif, col. 11, line 64-col. 12, line 67), (Nakamura, (col. 19, line 66-col. 20, line 18, also see Fig. 31).

11. In considering claim 8, the teachings of Latif provide a means for the network device to be a line card, (col. 5, lines 50-54).

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is (571) 272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER